DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 831 HE 008 150

AUTHOR Stout, Minard W.
TITLE What Knowledge Is Of Most Worth To Presidents Of Colleges And Universities?
NOTE 45p.; Best available copy

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Background; *Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; *Chief Administrators; *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

What knowledge is of most worth to a president of a college or university? To answer this, a questionnaire containing 169 specific areas of knowledge within 14 general areas of knowledge was evaluated by college and university presidents. Areas evaluated are: worth of knowledge about administration, curriculum, faculty and staff, finance, foundations of education, institutional research and planning, institutional types and purposes, instruction, legal aspects, organization, physical facilities, students, the higher education "establishment," and the president as a person. The 17 specific areas in the top 10 percent were from six of the 14 general areas of knowledge; seven were from finance; five from the president as a person; two from administration; one from faculty and staff; one from institutional research and planning; and one from students. (Author/KE)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED126831

# WHAT KNOWLEDGE IS OF MOST WORTH TO PRESIDENTS OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES?

by

Minard W. Stout

HE 008 150

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

## INTRODUCTION

What knowledge is of most worth to a president of a college or university? That was a question asked often by students enrolled in the Higher Education--Administration Doctor of Philosophy program in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Arizona State University.

The students were not alone in trying to determine what knowledge a person should have, in order to be a successful president, about: (1) the things that need to be done; and (2) how to do them. Examples of others to whom this was a serious question included:

1. Their professors and advisors;
2. Active presidents who wished to improve their abilities to fulfill many and varied responsibilities;
3. Active presidents who wished to use the knowledge in selecting supportive administrators;
4. Supportive administrators who wished to prepare themselves to become successful presidents;
5. Professors who openly or secretly sought the position;

6. Members of governing boards in search of a president.

In order to increase and improve the available information that could be used in answering the question, this study was designed and conducted. Since the people best qualified to answer the question, "What knowledge is of most worth to a college or university president?" were the presidents themselves, they were the ones to ask. A questionnaire was prepared which contained 169 specific areas of knowledge within 14 general areas of knowledge. Presidents were invited to evaluate, on the basis of their experience and study, each of the areas on a four-point scale--of most worth, of much worth, of some worth, or of little worth.

The questionnaire was included in a packet of materials mailed from the Arizona State University Center for the Study of Higher Education to presidents of colleges and universities. The covering letter to presidents, among other things, called their attention to the questionnaire and requested their help in determining what future presidents should study. Since only the responses of the presidents interested enough to respond to the first request were desired, no follow-up request was planned or conducted. Usable responses were received from 528 presidents. A description of the respondents is presented in Table 1. This

**Table 1**

**The Sex and Age of the Presidents of Colleges and Universities Participating in the Study and the Type, Control, and Enrollment of the Institutions Governed Shown in Percentages**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sex of Respondent | Male | 93% |
| | Female | 7% |
| Age of Respondent | 20's | 1% |
| | 30's | 7% |
| | 40's | 37% |
| | 50's | 42% |
| | 60's | 12% |
| | 70's | 1% |
| Type of Institutions | 2-year | 43% |
| | 4-year | 34% |
| | 5-year | 9% |
| | Above | 14% |
| Control of Institutions | Private | 46% |
| | Public | 54% |
| Total Enrollment (in thousands) | under 1 | 41% |
| | 1 to 5 | 40% |
| | 5 to 10 | 9% |
| | 10 to 20 | 8% |
| | 20 to 30 | 1% |
| | Above 30 | 1% |
| Total Number of Respondents | 528 | |
| States Represented | 49 | |

report presents the degree of worth to the responding presidents of each area of knowledge studied.

## The Worth of Specific Areas of Knowledge within General Areas of Knowledge

The 14 general areas of knowledge provide the organization for the presentation of the responses of presidents in evaluating the worth of the 169 specific areas of knowledge. For each general area a table has been prepared in which pertinent information about each specific area will be presented. Included are the following:

1. The General Area of Knowledge (GAOK)
2. The Specific Area of Knowledge (SAOK) included in the table.
3. The number of presidents responding to each.
4. The percentage of the respondents voting for each qualitative measure.
5. A weighted composite score (WCS). (Each qualitative measure was weighted--most=8, much=4, some=2, and little=1. Each qualitative measure percentage was multiplied by its weighting number and the results were added.)
6. The rank of each specific area of knowledge (SAOK) within that general area of knowledge (GAOK) based on weighted composite scores (WCS).

7. The percentile rank (PR) of each specific area of knowledge (SAOK) within the total study of 169 such areas.

The Worth of Knowledge about Administration

As seen in Table 2, there were two of 23 specific areas of knowledge about administration to which more than half of the responding presidents gave a rating of Most worth. They were (1) Delegation of Responsibility, 51.6%; and (3) Establishing Institutional Philosophy, 50.6%.

The range in the percentages of responding presidents for the 23 specific areas of knowledge about administration as being of Most worth was from (1) Delegation of Responsibility, 57.6%; down to (23) Biographies of Successful Presidents, 2.9%.

The combined percentage of the column for Most worth plus the one for Much worth provided four areas with a total vote of 90% or more of the presidents responding. These areas were (2) Delegation of Authority, 96.0%; (1) Delegation of Responsibility, 95.3%; (5) Motivation of subordinates, 91.1%; and (6) Establishing Basic Principles of Operation, 90.4%. By combining the two columns, Most and Much, the ranks of (2) Delegation of Authority and (1) Delegation of Responsibility were interchanged from what they were when only Most was considered.

The weighted composite scores for the 23 specific areas

Table 2

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Administration
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Delegation of Responsibility | 488 | 51.6% | 43.7% | 4.1% | 0.6% | 596 | 95 |
| 2 | Delegation of Authority | 474 | 47.9 | 48.1 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 583 | 90 |
| 3 | Establishing Institutional Philosophy | 480 | 50.6 | 39.2 | 9.8 | .4 | 582 | 89 |
| 4 | Selecting Supportive Administrators | 483 | 47.8 | 38.5 | 12.6 | 1.0 | 563 | 83 |
| 5 | Motivation of Subordinates | 473 | 43.1 | 48.0 | 8.7 | 0.2 | 554 | 82 |
| 6 | Establishing Basic Principles of Operations | 477 | 40.3 | 50.1 | 8.8 | 0.8 | 541 | 81 |
| 7 | Administering "through" Others | 480 | 40.0 | 47.5 | 10.8 | 1.7 | 534 | 79 |
| 8 | The Role of the Governing Board | 479 | 39.9 | 46.8 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 533 | 79 |
| 9 | Adopting Policies to fit Principles and Philosophy | 469 | 37.3 | 50.7 | 10.9 | 1.1 | 524 | 77 |
| 10 | Decision Making: Theory & Practice | 468 | 39.7 | 43.6 | 15.6 | 1.3 | 523 | 76 |
| 11 | The Role of the President | 482 | 34.4 | 45.2 | 18.5 | 1.9 | 495 | 72 |
| 12 | Public Relations | 475 | 32.4 | 49.1 | 16.8 | 1.7 | 491 | 69 |
| 13 | Evaluation, Promotion or Removal of Subordinates | 470 | 28.3 | 54.3 | 16.6 | 0.8 | 478 | 66 |
| 14 | Role of Supportive Administrators | 479 | 26.9 | 53.7 | 18.6 | 0.8 | 468 | 63 |
| 15 | Role of the Faculty in Governance | 479 | 23.4 | 53.0 | 21.9 | 1.7 | 445 | 53 |
| 16 | Role of Students in Administration | 477 | 17.2 | 41.9 | 35.4 | 5.5 | 382 | 30 |
| 17 | Theories of Administration | 477 | 12.6 | 43.0 | 41.7 | 2.7 | 359 | 21 |
| 18 | Case Studies of Successful Practices | 480 | 13.3 | 40.8 | 41.7 | 4.2 | 357 | 20 |
| 19 | The Role of State Government | 471 | 12.1 | 34.0 | 39.1 | 14.8 | 329 | 16 |
| 20 | Public Opinion and Propaganda | 476 | 9.2 | 35.1 | 46.2 | 9.5 | 316 | 12 |
| 21 | The Role of Pressure Groups | 476 | 8.8 | 30.9 | 44.5 | 16.2 | 296 | 7 |
| 22 | The Role of Federal Government | 471 | 6.6 | 33.5 | 46.1 | 13.8 | 293 | 7 |
| 23 | Biographies of Successful Presidents | 481 | 2.9 | 13.3 | 48.5 | 35.3 | 209 | 2 |

of knowledge in the general area of administration ranged from (1) Delegation of Responsibility--596 down to (23) Biographies of Successful Presidents--209. While none of the specific areas was in the 600's, there were ten in the 500 bracket, five in the 400's, five in the 300's, and three in the 200 bracket. The average of these 23 weighted composite scores was 454.

The percentile rank of the 23 items under administration ranged from a high of 95 for (1) Delegation of Responsibility down to a 2 PR for (23) Biographies of Successful Presidents. Ten of these specific areas about administration were in the top quartile of the total 169 items in the study and two were in the top decile. Five of the 23 areas were in the 2nd quartile, one in the 3rd, and seven were in the 4th or bottom quartile.

The Worth of Knowledge about Curriculum

Each of the 14 specific areas of knowledge about curriculum, as shown in Table 3, was ranked by some responding presidents as being of Most worth. The percentages ranged from a high of 39.9% for (1) The Administrator's Role in Determination of Curriculum, down to a low of 7.8% for (14) Professional Degree Programs.

When the percentages of Most worth and Much worth were combined, four areas received above 80% of the total responses. They were (1) The Administrator's Role in Determination

Table 3

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Curriculum
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The Administrator's Role in Determination of | 454 | 39.9% | 45.1% | 13.9% | 1.1% | .529 | 78 |
| 2 | The Governing Board's Role in Determination of | 455 | 33.9 | 47.0 | 16.5 | 2.6 | 495 | 72 |
| 3 | The College Faculty's Role in Determination of | 451 | 24.4 | 57.4 | 16.6 | 1.6 | 459 | 60 |
| 4 | The Student's Role in Determination of | 439 | 24.1 | 53.1 | 21.0 | 1.8 | 448 | 56 |
| 5 | The Department Faculty's Role in Determination of | 452 | 20.8 | 61.5 | 16.6 | 1.1 | 446 | 54 |
| 6 | The Professor's Role in Determination of | 447 | 21.7 | 56.6 | 20.1 | 1.6 | 442 | 51 |
| 7 | Junior College Academic or Transfer | 435 | 26.2 | 39.5 | 30.8 | 3.5 | 433 | 47 |
| 8 | Liberal Arts College--Lower Division | 433 | 21.9 | 49.4 | 26.3 | 2.4 | 428 | 43 |
| 9 | Junior College Technical or Career | 415 | 29.2 | 24.8 | 35.2 | 10.8 | 414 | 41 |
| 10 | Liberal Arts College--Upper Division | 401 | 16.7 | 47.9 | 30.9 | 4.5 | 392 | 34 |
| 11 | The University Faculty's Role in Determination of | 437 | 19.0 | 42.1 | 32.0 | 6.9 | 385 | 32 |
| 12 | Master's Degree Programs | 417 | 7.9 | 37.9 | 43.2 | 11.0 | 312 | 11 |
| 13 | Doctoral Degree Programs | 400 | 9.3 | 33.8 | 42.2 | 14.7 | 309 | 10 |
| 14 | Professional Degree Programs | 410 | 7.8 | 35.1 | 42.5 | 14.6 | 302 | 8 |

of Curriculum, 85.0%; (5) The Department Faculty's Role, 82.3%; (3) The College Faculty's Role, 81.8%; and (2) The Governing Board's Role in Determination of Curriculum, 80.9%. By combining the two quality measures, (5) The Department Faculty's Role got a higher ranking than when Most worth was considered alone.

The weighted composite scores ranged from a high of 529 for (1) The Administrator's Role down to 302 for (14) Professional Degree Programs. Rank number (1) was the only area in the 500 bracket. There were eight areas in the 400's and the remaining five areas in the 300's. The average weighted composite score for the 14 areas was 414.

The range in the percentile ranks of the 14 specific areas of knowledge was from the 78th down to the 8th. One specific area ranked in the top quartile of the 169 such areas. It was (1) The Administrator's Role in the Determination of Curriculum. Five areas were in the 2nd quartile, five more in the 3rd quartile, and three fell in the bottom quartile.

The Worth of Knowledge about Faculty and Staff

Each of the specific areas of knowledge in the general area of knowledge about faculty and staff received votes from responding presidents as being of Most worth. The percentage of votes for Most, as shown in Table 4, ranged from a high of 59.8% for (1) Communication with the Faculty

Table 4

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Faculty and Staff
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Communication with | 453 | 59.8% | 35.1% | 4.9% | 0.2% | 629 | 99 |
| 2 | Selection of | 462 | 49.1 | 39.0 | 11.3 | 0.6 | 572 | 86 |
| 3 | Evaluation of | 464 | 41.6 | 48.7 | 9.1 | 0.6 | 546 | 82 |
| 4 | Motivation of | 462 | 38.1 | 50.0 | 11.5 | 0.4 | 528 | 78 |
| 5 | Responsibilities of | 463 | 35.7 | 51.4 | 12.5 | 0.4 | 517 | 75 |
| 6 | Removal of | 460 | 32.4 | 50.0 | 15.6 | 2.0 | 492 | 70 |
| 7 | Wage & Salary Management | 469 | 30.7 | 53.1 | 15.4 | 0.8 | 490 | 69 |
| 8 | Promotion of | 460 | 29.2 | 54.1 | 15.4 | 1.3 | 482 | 67 |
| 9 | Authority of | 459 | 27.2 | 57.3 | 15.0 | 0.5 | 477 | 65 |
| 10 | Power of | 454 | 28.2 | 54.6 | 16.7 | 1.1 | 476 | 64 |
| 11 | Contract negotiations with | 449 | 27.6 | 44.5 | 24.7 | 3.1 | 451 | 57 |
| 12 | Assignment of | 454 | 22.9 | 50.0 | 26.2 | 0.9 | 437 | 49 |
| 13 | Tenure of | 465 | 21.9 | 51.4 | 24.3 | 2.4 | 432 | 46 |
| 14 | Search for | 455 | 19.1 | 46.8 | 31.2 | 2.9 | 405 | 39 |
| 15 | Sources of Supply | 448 | 17.9 | 48.9 | 29.9 | 3.3 | 402 | 37 |
| 16 | Organizations of | 460 | 17.0 | 48.7 | 30.4 | 3.9 | 396 | 36 |

and Staff, down to 17.0% for (16) Organizations of Faculty and Staff.

The combined percentages for Most and Much worth produced two SAOK above 90% of the votes. They were (1) Communication with, 94.9% and (3) Evaluation of Faculty and Staff, 90.3%. All 16 of the items in the general area of knowledge about faculty and staff received a combined percentage for Most and Much worth above 65% with ten of them above 82%.

The weighted composite scores ranged from a high of 629 down to a low of 396. Four of the items were in the 500 bracket and the remaining ten in the 400's. The average WCS was 483.

The WCS for each SAOK in this general area of knowledge drew percentile ranks in the total study ranging from a high of 99 PR for (1) Communication with Faculty and Staff, down to a PR of 36 for (16) Organizations of Faculty and Staff. Five of these items were in the top quartile of the total study, six were in the 2nd quartile, and the remaining five were in the 3rd quartile.

The Worth of Knowledge about Finance

Each of the 17 specific areas in the general area of knowledge about finance was regarded by some presidents as being of Most worth. As shown in Table 5, there were seven SAOK for which more than half of the responding presidents

Table 5

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Finance
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Budget Preparation | 462 | 59.3% | 35.1% | 5.2% | 0.4% | 626 | 98 |
| 2 | Where the Money Goes | 466 | 57.7 | 35.6 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 618 | 97 |
| 3 | Where the Money Comes from | 465 | 57.6 | 34.8 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 615 | 96 |
| 4 | Management of Money | 460 | 54.1 | 38.5 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 602 | 95 |
| 5 | Budget Presentation | 461 | 51.2 | 41.2 | 6.9 | 0.7 | 589 | 93 |
| 6 | Cost of Higher Education | 451 | 51.4 | 39.9 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 588 | 92 |
| 7 | Budgetary Control | 462 | 51.5 | 39.8 | 7.4 | 1.3 | 587 | 92 |
| 8 | Who Manages the Money? | 462 | 48.5 | 42.6 | 8.4 | 0.4 | 576 | 88 |
| 9 | Fund Raising Techniques | 460 | 38.0 | 34.8 | 21.1 | 6.1 | 492 | 70 |
| 10 | Federal Funds | 460 | 28.7 | 49.6 | 18.5 | 3.2 | 468 | 63 |
| 11 | Proposal Follow Up | 455 | 27.3 | 49.9 | 19.3 | 3.5 | 460 | 60 |
| 12 | Proposal Presentation | 458 | 26.7 | 47.8 | 21.8 | 3.7 | 452 | 58 |
| 13 | Proposal Preparation | 461 | 25.8 | 47.7 | 22.8 | 3.7 | 447 | 55 |
| 14 | Foundation Giving | 461 | 25.6 | 42.1 | 26.0 | 6.3 | 431 | 45 |
| 15 | Financial Audits | 460 | 23.7 | 45.7 | 26.5 | 4.1 | 430 | 44 |
| 16 | Investment of Funds | 459 | 25.1 | 42.5 | 25.7 | 6.7 | 428 | 43 |
| 17 | Financial Report Writing | 439 | 18.5 | 40.3 | 35.1 | 6.1 | 385 | 32 |

gave a value rating of Most. The range in the percentages of votes for Most worth for the 17 SAOK in this 5 GAOK was from a high 59.3% for (1) Budget Preparation, down to a low of 18.5% for (17) Finance Report Writing.

When the percentage in the Much worth column was added to that in the Most worth column, the total percentage of votes for each of first eight ranked SAOK was above 90%. Two other items received more than three-fourths of such votes: (1) Federal Funds, 78.3%; and (11) Proposal Follow Up, 77.2%.

The range in the weighted composite scores was from a high of 626 down to a low of 385. Four of the scores were over 600; four more in the 500's, eight in the 400's, and one in the 300 bracket. The average for the 17 such scores was 517.

When the weighted composite scores of these 17 SAOK were placed among those for the total study, the top seven of them had percentile ranks in the top decile. The 8th, Who Manages the Money? was at the 88 PR. The remaining nine SAOK had PR's below 75, of which four were below 50 PR. The range in the distribution of PR's for the general area of finance was from a high of 98 for (1) Budget Preparation, down to a low of 32 for (17) Financial Report Writing.

The Worth of Knowledge about the Foundations of Education

There were four specific areas in this general area of

knowledge with each receiving votes from some presidents as being of Most worth. The range in the percentage of votes for Most, as shown in Table 6, was from 18.9% for (1) Philosophical Foundations, down to 9.2% for (4) Historical Foundations.

By combining the percentages of the columns for Most and Much, two of the specific areas were in the low 60's and one in the high 50's. The fourth item totaled fewer than half, 45.6%.

The weighted composite scores were all in the 300 bracket with a high of 398, a low of 321, and an average of 367.

When placed in the percentile rank distribution of 169 specific areas in the total study, the range for items in this general area of knowledge was from a high of 36 PR for Philosophical Foundations, down to a 12 PR for Historical Foundations.

The Worth of Knowledge about Institutional Research and Planning

As shown in Table 7, there were 15 specific areas in the general area of knowledge about institutional research and planning, and each received some votes from responding presidents as being of Most worth. For one of them, (1) Long-Range Planning, more than half, 53.6% of the presidents valued it as of Most worth. The range in percentages of

Table 6

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about the Foundations of Education to Presidents of Colleges and Universities Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Philosophical | 466 | 18.9% | 44.4% | 32.0% | 4.7% | 398 | 36 |
| 2 | Sociological | 463 | 14.3 | 47.1 | 34.1 | 4.5 | 376 | 27 |
| 3 | Psychological | 460 | 14.8 | 44.6 | 36.3 | 4.3 | 374 | 26 |
| 4 | Historical | 456 | 9.2 | 36.4 | 47.4 | 7.0 | 321 | 12 |

Table 7

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Institutional Research and Planning to Presidents of Colleges and Universities Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Long-Range Planning | 444 | 53.6% | 36.9% | 8.8% | 0.7% | 595 | 94 |
| 2 | Financial Analysis, Evaluation & Planning | 446 | 41.3 | 45.9 | 11.9 | 0.9 | 539 | 80 |
| 3 | Program Analysis, Evaluation & Planning | 448 | 35.9 | 49.6 | 14.1 | 0.4 | 514 | 75 |
| 4 | Faculty Analysis, Evaluation & Planning | 451 | 34.1 | 52.3 | 12.9 | 0.7 | 509 | 73 |
| 5 | Physical Facilities Analysis, Evaluation & Planning | 452 | 25.7 | 55.1 | 18.6 | 0.6 | 464 | 62 |
| 6 | Enrollment Studies | 447 | 24.4 | 51.0 | 23.3 | 1.3 | 447 | 55 |
| 7 | Unit Cost Studies | 451 | 22.2 | 50.8 | 24.8 | 2.2 | 433 | 47 |
| 8 | Short-Range Stair-Step Planning | 421 | 16.6 | 48.9 | 29.7 | 4.8 | 393 | 35 |
| 9 | Introductory Statistical Procedures | 446 | 21.3 | 37.2 | 44.8 | 6.7 | 395 | 34 |
| 10 | Program Planning Budgeting System (PPBS) | 392 | 16.1 | 47.2 | 31.1 | 5.6 | 385 | 32 |
| 11 | Non-Academic Staff Analysis, Evaluation & Planning | 452 | 15.3 | 47.3 | 35.4 | 2.0 | 384 | 30 |
| 12 | Demographic Studies | 439 | 16.4 | 42.1 | 38.7 | 2.7 | 380 | 28 |
| 13 | Computers & Their Uses | 447 | 13.9 | 45.6 | 36.2 | 4.3 | 370 | 24 |
| 14 | "Pert" or "CPM" | 401 | 11.2 | 39.9 | 42.2 | 6.7 | 340 | 17 |
| 15 | Multivariate Statistical Procedures | 441 | 4.8 | 16.1 | 51.2 | 27.9 | 233 | 2 |

votes for Most worth for the 15 SAOK about institutional research and planning was from the high of 53.6% for (1) Long-Range Planning down to a low of 4.8% for (15) Multivariate Statistical Procedures.

When percentages in the column for Much worth were added to those for Most worth, (1) Long-Range Planning received 90.5% of the votes cast. Four specific areas about Analysis, Evaluation and Planning had combined percentages in the 80's: (2) Financial, 87.2%; (4) Faculty, 86.4%; (3) Program, 85.5%; and (5) Physical Facilities, 80.8%.

The weighted composite scores for these 15 specific areas of knowledge ranged from a high of 595 for (1) Long-Range Planning, down to a low of 233 for (15) Multivariate Statistical Procedures. Four of the WCS's were in the 500 bracket, three in the 400's, seven in the 300's, and the 15th with a 233 was 107 points below the next lowest. The average of the 15 WCS was 425.

One of the specific areas of knowledge about Institutional Research and Planning, (1) Long-Range Planning, had a percentile rank of 94 among the 169 items in the total study. Two more SAOK, Analysis, Evaluation and Planning of (2) Finance, 80 PR and (3) Program, 75 PR, were in the top quartile. The range of percentile ranks for these 15 SAOK was from the previously mentioned 94 down to a 2 PR for Multivariate Statistical Procedures. In addition to

the above three SAOK in the top quartile, three were in the second, six in the third, and three in the bottom fourth.

The Worth of Knowledge about Institutional Types and Purposes

As shown in Table 8, there were 11 specific areas in this general area of knowledge and each received votes from some presidents as being of Most worth. The range in the percentages of votes for Most worth was from 25.2% for (1) Community Junior Colleges, down to 1.8% for (11) Colonial Colleges.

By combining the percentages for Most and Much, one item received more than half of the votes, (1) Community Junior Colleges, with 55.0%.

The weighted composite scores for the 11 specific areas ranged from a high of 403 for (1) Community Junior Colleges, down to 190 for (11) Colonial Colleges. The average WCS for this general area was 292.

The percentile ranks derived from the position of the WCS of the SAOK in this GAOK in the distribution of 169 for the total study show a range from a high of 38 PR for (1) Community Junior Colleges down to a 0 PR for (11) Colonial Colleges. All WCS for this GAOK were in the lower quartile except for (1) Community Junior Colleges at 38 PR.

The Worth of Knowledge about Instruction

All of the ten specific areas in the general area of knowledge about instruction received some votes for being

Table 8

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Types and Purposes of Institutions to Presidents of Colleges and Universities Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Community Junior Colleges | 450 | 25.2% | 29.8% | 34.7% | 10.0% | 403 | 38 |
| 2 | Private Liberal Arts Colleges | 451 | 14.2 | 27.7 | 44.6 | 13.5 | 327 | 14 |
| 3 | State Universities | 447 | 11.0 | 34.7 | 43.8 | 10.5 | 325 | 14 |
| 4 | State Colleges | 444 | 9.2 | 36.7 | 43.5 | 10.6 | 310 | 11 |
| 5 | Land-Grant Colleges | 444 | 8.6 | 30.4 | 47.5 | 13.5 | 295 | 8 |
| 6 | Technical Institutes | 447 | 10.1 | 27.3 | 40.5 | 22.1 | 293 | 7 |
| 7 | Private Junior Colleges | 444 | 9.2 | 27.3 | 46.6 | 16.9 | 292 | 6 |
| 8 | Private Universities | 448 | 6.2 | 31,5 | 49.1 | 13.2 | 287 | 5 |
| 9 | Municipal Colleges and Municipal Universities | 444 | 6.5 | 29.5 | 49.8 | 14.2 | 284 | 4 |
| 10 | Proprietary Colleges | 433 | 2.1 | 12.9 | 48.3 | 36.7 | 202 | 1 |
| 11 | Colonial Colleges | 436 | 1.8 | 11.0 | 44.3 | 42.9 | 190 | 0 |

of Most worth. The range in the percentage of votes for Most worth was from a high of 34.4% for (1) The Role of Administrators, down to 14.1% for (10) Educational Psychology. As shown in Table 9, seven of the ten SAOK received fewer than 25% of the votes for Most worth. The other three received above 25% but less than half of the votes.

By combining the votes cast for the top two quality measures of Most and Much worth, two of the SAOK received more than three-fourths of the votes cast. They were (1) The Role of Administrators, 82.7%, and (4) The Role of the Faculty, 78.3%.

The weighted composite scores ranged from a high of 502 down to 373. One WCS made the 500 bracket while one was in the 300's with the other eight items in the 400 bracket. The average WCS was 440.

The above scores earned these specific areas percentile rankings in the total study from a high of 72 PR for (1) The Role of the Administrator, down to a 25 PR for (10) Educational Psychology. In addition to these items, one was in the 60's, three in the 50's, and four in the 40's of the percentile rankings.

The Worth of Knowledge about the Legal Aspects

All of the specific areas in the general area of knowledge about legal aspects of higher education received support from some responding presidents as being of Most worth.

Table 9

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Instruction
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The Role of Administrators | 445 | 34.4% | 48.3% | 16.0% | 1.3% | 502 | 72 |
| 2 | Techniques for Motivation of Learning | 461 | 29.5 | 43.6 | 24.1 | 2.8 | 461 | 61 |
| 3 | Techniques for Evaluation of Learning | 461 | 28.0 | 45.1 | 23.6 | 3.3 | 455 | 59 |
| 4 | The Role of the Faculty | 464 | 23.3 | 55.0 | 20.7 | 1.0 | 449 | 56 |
| 5 | The Role of the Students | 460 | 23.3 | 51.5 | 23.5 | 1.7 | 441 | 50 |
| 6 | Quality Control--Analysis & Evaluation | 454 | 25.3 | 44.7 | 27.8 | 2.2 | 437 | 49 |
| 7 | Methods of Instruction | 457 | 23.6 | 46.8 | 26.1 | 3.5 | 432 | 46 |
| 8 | The Role of the Individual Professor | 458 | 21.8 | 50.2 | 26.0 | 2.0 | 429 | 44 |
| 9 | Psychology of Learning | 461 | 21.0 | 47.1 | 28.6 | 3.3 | 417 | 41 |
| 10 | Educational Psychology | 447 | 14.1 | 46.3 | 35.6 | 4.0 | 373 | 25 |

As seen in Table 10, the percentage of votes for Most worth ranged from a high of 17.6% for (2) Contract Negotiations, down to a low of 10.7% for (6) Constitutional Law.

The combined percentages for Most and Much place (1) Recent Court Decisions in first place with 62.9% of the votes. Contract Negotiations received 60.3% of the votes and ranked second in this general area.

The weighted composite scores for this GAOK ranged from a high of 391 for (1) Recent Court Decisions, down to 328 for (6) Constitutional Law. The average for the six scores was 363.

The percentile ranks of these SAOK's ranged from a high of 33 PR for (1) Recent Court Decisions, down to a low of 15 PR for (6) Constitutional Law. Three of these areas were in the bottom quartile and three in the third.

The Worth of Knowledge about Organization

Each of the six specific areas in the general area of knowledge about the organization of higher education received votes as being of Most worth from some responding presidents. As shown in Table 11, the range in the percentages of votes for Most worth was from a high of 30.0% for (1) Functional Organization, down to 4.9% for (6) Federal Organization. All but one of the six specific areas received less than 25% of the votes for Most worth.

When the percentages for Most and Much were combined,

Table 10

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Legal Aspects
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Recent Court Decisions | 431 | 17.2% | 45.7% | 33.2% | 3.9% | 391 | 33 |
| 2 | Contract Negotiations | 454 | 17.6 | 42.7 | 35.5 | 4.2 | 387 | 33 |
| 3 | The Role of the Courts | 451 | 15.5 | 42.3 | 37.5 | 4.7 | 373 | 25 |
| 4 | Administrative Law | 452 | 15.5 | 38.9 | 39.8 | 5.8 | 365 | 22 |
| 5 | Business Law | 446 | 11.2 | 37.0 | 43.7 | 8.1 | 333 | 17 |
| 6 | Constitutional Law | 448 | 10.7 | 36.0 | 45.5 | 7.8 | 328 | 15 |

Table 11

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about The Organization of Higher Education to Presidents of Colleges and Universities Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Functional Organization | 433 | 30.0% | 51.8% | 16.6% | 1.6% | 482 | 67 |
| 2 | Structural Organization | 433 | 24.5 | 53.1 | 20.1 | 2.3 | 451 | 57 |
| 3 | Organizational Behavior | 434 | 18.9 | 49.1 | 29.0 | 3.0 | 409 | 40 |
| 4 | Organization of State Systems | 460 | 16.1 | 45.2 | 31.5 | 7.2 | 380 | 28 |
| 5 | Regional Organization | 455 | 5.6 | 32.7 | 49.4 | 12.3 | 287 | 5 |
| 6 | Federal Organization | 452 | 4.9 | 27.4 | 55.5 | 12.2 | 272 | 3 |

two of the items received more than 75% of the votes. They were (1) Functional Organization, 81.8% and (2) Structural Organization, 77.6%.

The range in the weighted composite scores was from a high of 482 down to 272. The distribution shows three scores in the 400 bracket, one in the 300's, and two in the 200 group. The average WCS in this GAOK was 380.

When compared to the scores of the 169 areas in the total study, all six of these items fell below the top quartile. The range of percentile ranks was from a high of 67 for (1) Functional Organization, down to a low of 3 PR for Federal Organization. The distribution shows two items in each of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quartiles.

The Worth of Knowledge about Physical Facilities

Each of the specific areas in the general area of knowledge about physical facilities was rated by some responding presidents as being of Most worth. As seen in Table 12, the range of the percentage of votes for Most worth was from a high of 49.4% for (2) Funding, down to a low of 11.8% for (8) Equipment and Materials Management. Although (2) Funding had the highest percentage of votes for Most, it ranked second to (1) Planning in this general area of knowledge, because the ranks in Table 12 were based on the weighted composite score, derived from all four levels of worth. These two specific areas were the only ones in this

Table 12

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Physical Facilities
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Planning | 462 | 47.8% | 46.5% | 5.6% | 0.0% | 580 | 89 |
| 2 | Funding | 464 | 49.4 | 41.4 | 8.4 | 0.8 | 578 | 88 |
| 3 | Utilization | 438 | 24.2 | 51.4 | 22.1 | 2.3 | 446 | 54 |
| 4 | Designing (Architects) | 464 | 18.8 | 55.2 | 24.3 | 1.7 | 422 | 42 |
| 5 | Maintenance | 465 | 14.0 | 50.5 | 31.2 | 4.3 | 381 | 29 |
| 6 | Scheduling Usage | 465 | 14.6 | 45.8 | 34.9 | 4.7 | 375 | 27 |
| 7 | Construction | 465 | 12.5 | 48.8 | 34.0 | 4.7 | 368 | 24 |
| 8 | Equipment & Materials Management | 458 | 11.8 | 42.1 | 40.4 | 5.7 | 349 | 19 |

general area to receive more than 25% of the votes cast for Most worth.

When the percentages of votes for Most and Much were combined, two SAOK received more than 90% of the votes cast. They were (1) Planning, 94.3% and (2) Funding, 90.8%. Another specific area received more than three-fourths of the votes in the combination, (3) Utilization, 75.6%.

The weighted composite scores ranged from a high of 580 down to 349 for low. Two of the SAOK had scores in the high 500 bracket, two in the 400's, and four in the 300's. The average WCS was 437.

The percentile ranks for the eight specific areas of knowledge about physical facilities ranged from a high of 89 for (1) Planning, down to a low of 19 for (8) Equipment and Materials Management. Two specific areas in this general area had PR's in the top quartile, one in the second, three in the third, and two in the bottom quartile.

The Worth of Knowledge about Students

As shown in Table 13, each of the 14 specific areas in the general area of knowledge about students received some votes from responding presidents as being of Most worth. The range in the percentage of votes for Most worth was from a high of 50.5% for (1) Concerns of Students, down to 9.6% for (14) Migration of Students. Only the one SAOK received more than half of the votes for Most worth; three of them

Table 13

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about Students
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Concerns of Students | 469 | 50.5% | 42.2% | 7.3% | 0.0% | 587 | 92 |
| 2 | Psychology of | 449 | 35.9 | 47.6 | 15.8 | 0.7 | 510 | 74 |
| 3 | Desires of | 465 | 34.0 | 51.4 | 13.1 | 1.5 | 505 | 73 |
| 4 | Counseling of | 451 | 31.5 | 47.7 | 19.5 | 1.3 | 483 | 67 |
| 5 | Administration of Services for | 429 | 23.3 | 53.6 | 21.5 | 1.6 | 445 | 53 |
| 6 | Minorities of | 464 | 24.1 | 48.3 | 25.0 | 2.6 | 439 | 50 |
| 7 | Power of | 462 | 18.8 | 50.9 | 28.1 | 2.2 | 412 | 40 |
| 8 | Activities of | 445 | 17.5 | 51.0 | 28.5 | 2.9 | 404 | 38 |
| 9 | Organization of Services for | 448 | 17.0 | 50.2 | 30.1 | 2.7 | 400 | 37 |
| 10 | Pressure Groups of | 461 | 17.1 | 43.0 | 34.9 | 5.0 | 384 | 30 |
| 11 | Organizations of | 461 | 12.6 | 46.9 | 37.3 | 3.2 | 366 | 23 |
| 12 | Housing of | 442 | 14.2 | 42.3 | 35.7 | 7.7 | 362 | 21 |
| 13 | Feeding of | 442 | 13.8 | 40.3 | 40.3 | 5.6 | 358 | 20 |
| 14 | Migration of | 449 | 9.6 | 29.6 | 51.5 | 9.3 | 308 | 9 |

fell in the third quartile. The rest received fewer than 25% of the votes as being of Most worth.

By combining the percentages of votes for Most and Much, one SAOK, (1) Concerns of Students, received 92.7%. Four others received more than three-fourths of the votes: (3) Desires of Students, 85.4%; (2) Psychology of Students, 83.7%; (4) Counseling of Students, 79.2%; and (5) Administration of Services for Students, 76.9%. When only the percentage of votes for Most was considered, knowledge about the Psychology of students ranked second; but when the percentages of Most and Much were combined, knowledge about the Desires of Students became more important.

The weighted composite scores for these 14 specific areas ranged from a high of 587 down to a low of 308 with an average of 426. Three of the WCS were in the 500's, six in the 400's, and five in the 300 bracket.

The percentile ranks for these 14 specific areas of knowledge about students ranged from a high of 92 PR for (1) Concerns of Students, down to a low of 9 PR for (14) Migration of Students. Only one of the 14 items had a PR in the upper quartile of the total study and it also ranked in the top decile. Five of these SAOK were in the second quartile, four in the third, and four in the bottom 25% of the percentile ranks.

The Worth of Knowledge about "The Establishment" of Higher Education

Of the seven specific areas in the general area of knowledge about "The Establishment" of Higher Education, each received some votes from the responding presidents as being of Most worth. As shown in Table 14, the range in the percentages of such votes was from a high of 27.0% for (1) Regional Accrediting Agencies, down to 8.4% for (7) Professional Organizations for Individuals.

When the percentages for Much worth were added to those for Most, four specific areas showed subtotals of more than half of the votes. Three of them were in the 50's and one, (1) Regional Accrediting Agencies, had a 74.8%.

The weighted composite scores ranged from a high of 456 down to a low of 304. The average was 353. Six of the seven scores were in the 300 bracket and one got up into the 400's.

The highest percentile rank for any of these seven SAOK was a 59 PR for (1) Regional Accrediting Agencies. The other six fell in the lower quartile with the lowest being a nine PR for (7) Professional Organizations for Individuals.

The Worth of Knowledge about the President as a Person

As shown in Table 15, there were 18 specific areas in the general area of knowledge about the President as a Person

Table 14

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about The Establishment of Higher Education to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Accrediting Agencies | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Regional (General) | 448 | 27.0% | 47.8% | 23.2% | 2.0% | 456 | 59 |
| 2 | Professional (Specialized) | 426 | 13.2 | 45.1 | 36.8 | 4.9 | 365 | 22 |
| | Associations of Institutions | | | | | | | |
| 3 | State | 439 | 11.8 | 41.5 | 41.0 | 5.7 | 348 | 18 |
| 4 | Regional | 421 | 12.6 | 38.2 | 43.0 | 6.2 | 346 | 18 |
| 5 | National | 436 | 10.5 | 35.8 | 46.8 | 6.9 | 328 | 15 |
| | Professional Organizations | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Institutional Memberships | 441 | 10.7 | 33.6 | 48.7 | 7.0 | 324 | 13 |
| 7 | Individual Memberships | 426 | 8.4 | 31.1 | 52.1 | 8.4 | 304 | 9 |

Table 15

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge about The President as a Person
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank in Percentages, Weighted Composite Score, and Percentile Rank

| Rank | Area of Knowledge | Number of Respondents | Is of Most Worth | Is of Much Worth | Is of Some Worth | Is of Little Worth | Weighted Composite Score | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Human Relations | 408 | 69.9% | 25.2% | 3.9% | 1.0% | 669 | 99 |
| 2 | Ability to Stand Alone | 450 | 60.0 | 31.8 | 6.7 | 1.6 | 622 | 98 |
| 3 | Character | 459 | 61.2 | 22.9 | 11.3 | 4.6 | 608 | 96 |
| 4 | Cardinal Virtue--Justice | 447 | 55.5 | 30.4 | 10.5 | 3.6 | 590 | 93 |
| 5 | Cardinal Virtue--Courage | 442 | 54.7 | 30.8 | 10.9 | 3.6 | 586 | 91 |
| 6 | Public Speaking | 457 | 48.1 | 44.2 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 576 | 88 |
| 7 | Professional Responsibilities | 461 | 48.8 | 41.2 | 9.6 | 0.4 | 575 | 86 |
| 8 | Participation in Discussion | 450 | 47.1 | 45.1 | 6.9 | 0.9 | 572 | 86 |
| 9 | Morals | 462 | 52.6 | 29.9 | 12.5 | 5.0 | 571 | 85 |
| 10 | Cardinal Virtue--Prudence | 432 | 51.4 | 32.7 | 12.0 | 3.9 | 570 | 84 |
| 11 | Ability to Live through Others | 446 | 48.4 | 37.7 | 12.3 | 1.6 | 564 | 83 |
| 12 | Personal Responsibilities | 441 | 42.6 | 42.0 | 13.1 | 2.3 | 537 | 80 |
| 13 | Cardinal Virtue--Temperance | 444 | 40.3 | 39.6 | 16.0 | 4.1 | 517 | 76 |
| 14 | Manners | 463 | 35.2 | 41.9 | 17.5 | 5.4 | 490 | 69 |
| 15 | Family Responsibilities | 459 | 34.0 | 39.7 | 20.0 | 6.3 | 477 | 65 |
| 16 | Social Responsibilities | 459 | 30.7 | 45.5 | 19.0 | 4.8 | 470 | 63 |
| 17 | Appearance | 452 | 26.2 | 46.5 | 21.1 | 6.2 | 444 | 51 |
| 18 | Professional Writing | 453 | 23.6 | 48.6 | 25.8 | 2.0 | 437 | 49 |

for the responding presidents to evaluate. Six of the items were rated of Most worth by more than half of the presidents and three of these received more than 60% of the votes. The range in the percentages of votes for Most worth was from a high of 69.9% for (1) Human Relations, down to a low of 23.6% for (18) Professional Writing.

When the percentages of Most worth and Much worth were combined, none of the 18 SAOK had fewer than 60% of the votes. Five of them had combined percentages in the 90's: (1) Human Relations, 95.1%; (6) Public Speaking, 92.3%; (8) Participation in Discussion, 92.2%; (2) Ability to Stand Alone, 91.8%; and (7) Professional Responsibilities, 90.0%. For seven other SAOK these combined percentages totaled over 80% of the votes cast.

The weighted composite scores for these 18 specific areas of knowledge ranged from a high of 669 down to a low of 437. Three of the scores were over 600 and five were below 500. The remaining 10 were in the 500's. The average of the 18 WCS was 549.

One specific area in the general area of knowledge about the President as a Person was placed at the 99 PR when compared to the other 168 SAOK in the study: (1) Human Relations, 99 PR. The percentile ranks for these areas ranged from that high down to (18) Professional Writing, 49 PR, which was the only one below the 50th PR. Thirteen of the 18 SAOK about the President as a Person had percentile

rankings in the top quartile of the total study. Five of them ranked in the top decile: (1) Human Relations, 99 PR; (2) Ability to Stand Alone, 98 PR; (3) Character, 96 PR; (4) Cardinal Virtue--Justice, 93 PR; and Cardinal Virtue--Courage, 91 PR. Two-thirds of the 18 SAOK in this general area had percentile ranks of 80 or higher.

## THE WORTH OF GENERAL AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE

The relative worth of general areas of knowledge to presidents of colleges and universities is shown in Table 16. The 14 general areas studied are shown in the order of ranks based upon the average of the weighted composite scores of the specific areas within each. To be seen in Table 16 also are the numbers of specific areas, the range of composite weighted scores, and the average number of respondents within each general area of knowledge.

The average weighted composite scores for the 14 GAOK ranged from a high of 549 for (1) The President as a Person, down to a low of 292 for (14) Types and Purposes of Institutions. Also in the 500 bracket, but 32 points below number (1), was (2) Finance with an average WCS of 517. Below these two general areas there were seven with weighted composite score averages in the 400's, four in the 300's, and one in the 200's.

Table 16

The Worth of General Areas of Knowledge
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown by Rank Order of the Average of Weighted Composite Scores
for Specific Areas within the General Area

| Rank | General Area of Knowledge | Average Number of Respondents | Number of Specific Areas | Weighted Composite Scores | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Range | Average |
| 1 | The President as a Person | 449 | 18 | 437-669 | 549 |
| 2 | Finance | 459 | 17 | 385-626 | 517 |
| 3 | Faculty and Staff | 459 | 16 | 396-629 | 483 |
| 4 | Administration | 477 | 23 | 209-596 | 454 |
| 5 | Instruction | 457 | 10 | 373-502 | 440 |
| 6 | Physical Facilities | 460 | 8 | 349-580 | 437 |
| 7 | Students | 453 | 14 | 308-587 | 426 |
| 8 | Institutional Research & Planning | 439 | 15 | 233-595 | 425 |
| 9 | Curriculum | 432 | 14 | 302-529 | 414 |
| 10 | Organization | 445 | 6 | 272-482 | 380 |
| 11 | Foundations of Education | 461 | 4 | 321-398 | 367 |
| 12 | Legal Aspects | 447 | 6 | 328-391 | 363 |
| 13 | The "Establishment" | 434 | 7 | 304-456 | 353 |
| 14 | Types & Purposes of Institutions | 444 | 11 | 190-403 | 292 |

## THE KNOWLEDGE OF MOST WORTH

There were 169 specific areas of knowledge, within 14 general areas, which presidents of colleges and universities were asked to evaluate as being of (1) Most worth, (2) Much worth, (3) Some worth, or (4) Little worth. A total of 528 usable replies were received. Not all presidents replied to all 169 items, so the tables show the number responding to each specific area of knowledge with the percentage of that number who indicated it was of Most, or Much, or Some, or Little worth. These four divisions of worth were given weights: Most=8; Much=4; Some=2; and Little=1. By multiplying each percentage by the designated weight and adding the four results, a weighted composite score was derived for each of the 169 specific areas of knowledge. The weighted composite scores were used to determine the percentile rank in the total study for each specific area of knowledge.

### The Top Ten Percent

The knowledge of most worth to college and university presidents, as determined by this study, is shown in Table 17. Seen on the first page of the table are the top ten percent of the specific areas of knowledge studied.

The 17 specific areas in the top ten percent were from six of the 14 general areas of knowledge: seven were from Finance; five from the President as a Person; two from

Table 17

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown in Percentile Rank with Reference to Previous Presentation

The Top Ten Percent

| Reference Table | Reference Rank | Area of Knowledge | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 1 | Human Relations | 99 |
| 4 | 1 | Communication with Faculty & Staff | 99 |
| 5 | 1 | Budget Preparation | 98 |
| 15 | 2 | Ability to Stand Alone | 98 |
| 5 | 2 | Where the Money Goes | 97 |
| 5 | 3 | Where the Money Comes from | 96 |
| 15 | 3 | Character | 96 |
| 5 | 4 | Management of Money | 95 |
| 2 | 1 | Delegation of Responsibility | 95 |
| 7 | 1 | Long-Range Planning | 94 |
| 15 | 4 | Cardinal Virtue-Justice | 93 |
| 5 | 5 | Budget Presentation | 93 |
| 5 | 6 | Cost of Higher Education | 92 |
| 5 | 7 | Budgetary Control | 92 |
| 13 | 1 | Concerns of Students | 92 |
| 15 | 5 | Cardinal Virtue-Courage | 91 |
| 2 | 2 | Delegation of Authority | 90 |

Administration; and one each from Faculty and Staff, Institutional Research and Planning, and Students.

The Top Quartile

The next 15% of the top quartile of specific areas of knowledge included under the heading "The Knowledge of Most Worth" are shown on Table 17 (continued).

The 43 specific areas of knowledge, in the top quartile, are from eight of the 14 general areas of knowledge included in the study. There were 13 specific areas from the general area: The President as a Person, in the top quartile; 10 SAOK from Administration; eight from Finance; five from Faculty and Staff; three from Institutional Research and Planning; two from Physical Facilities; and one each from Curriculum, and Students.

The percentile and quartile ranks of the remaining 126 specific areas of knowledge included in this study can be found in Tables 2 to 15 inclusive.

## THE WORTH OF CENTERS FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION--ADMINISTRATION

As a part of this study, an attempt was made to determine the worth of Centers for the Study of Higher Education--Administration as a place for potential presidents of colleges and universities to obtain the knowledge they would need.

It was explained in the introduction to this report

Table 17 (continued)

The Worth of Different Areas of Knowledge
to Presidents of Colleges and Universities
Shown in Percentile Rank with Reference to Previous Presentation

The Top Quartile (continued)

| Reference Table | Reference Rank | Area of Knowledge | Percentile Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 3 | Establishing Institutional Philosophy | 89 |
| 12 | 1 | Planning Physical Facilities | 89 |
| 12 | 2 | Funding Physical Facilities | 88 |
| 5 | 8 | Who Manages the Money? | 88 |
| 15 | 6 | Public Speaking | 88 |
| 15 | 7 | Professional Responsibilities | 86 |
| 4 | 2 | Selection of Faculty & Staff | 86 |
| 15 | 8 | Participation in Discussions | 86 |
| 15 | 9 | Morals | 85 |
| 15 | 10 | Cardinal Virtue-Prudence | 84 |
| 15 | 11 | Ability to Live "through" Others | 83 |
| 2 | 4 | Selecting Supportive Administrators | 83 |
| 2 | 5 | Motivation of Subordinates | 82 |
| 4 | 3 | Evaluation of Faculty & Staff | 82 |
| 2 | 6 | Establishing Basic Principles of Operations | 81 |
| 7 | 2 | Financial Analysis Evaluation & Planning | 80 |
| 15 | 12 | Personal Responsibilities | 80 |
| 2 | 7 | Administering "through" Others | 79 |
| 2 | 8 | The Role of the Governing Boards | 79 |
| 3 | 1 | Administration's Role in Determining Curriculum | 78 |
| 4 | 4 | Motivation of Faculty & Staff | 78 |
| 2 | 9 | Adapting Policies To Fit Principles & Philosophy | 77 |
| 2 | 10 | Decision Making--Theory & Practice | 76 |
| 15 | 13 | Cardinal Virtue--Temperance | 76 |
| 4 | 5 | Responsibilities of Faculty & Staff | 75 |
| 7 | 3 | Program Analysis, Evaluation & Planning | 75 |

that the questionnaire for this study was included in a packet of materials about the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Arizona State University. Also enclosed was a brochure which described the Center, its Doctor of Philosophy program in Higher Education--Administration, resumes of its graduates available for positions, and abstracts of dissertations completed in the past year.

The back page of the questionnaire asked five questions of the presidents pertaining to their thoughts about such Centers for the Study of Higher Education--Administration as a place for potential presidents to acquire knowledge they would need. Those questions and the presidents' responses follow.

Question 1

Do you think the college or university president of the future must have a more effective professional preparation for the position than has been available in the past?

Respondents--505

Yes--86.9%

No--13.1%

Question 2

Do you think a program of professional study such as that described in the enclosed brochure could be of much worth in the preparation of a president-to-be?

Respondents--469

Yes--93.2%

No-- 6.8%

Question 3

Do you think such a program of professional study has the potential to prepare the president-to-be better than the master's and doctorate in an academic discipline pattern of the past?

Respondents--447

Yes--81.5%

No--18.5%

Question 4

Should you have a vacancy on your supportive administrative staff, would you consider a graduate of our Center, such as those now available whose resumes are enclosed?

Respondents--475

Yes--91.4%

No-- 8.6%

Question 5

Should you know a person desiring to prepare to be a president or a supportive administrator, would you advise him to consider our Center as a place for such preparation?

Respondents--440

Yes--92.5%

No-- 7.5%

The presidents were asked also to answer a sixth question as an indication of their interest in acquiring additional information on what knowledge is of most worth to a president

of a college or university. The question and the results of their responses follow.

Question 6

Do you wish a report on the findings of this study?

Respondents--511

Yes--91.4%

No-- 8.6%

## PROFESSIONAL RESUME

**MINARD W. STOUT**

Center for the Study of Higher Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281
Phone: (602) 965-6248. Home: 324 East Concorda Drive, Tempe, Arizona 85282 Phone: (602) 966-5250.

### EDUCATION AND DEGREES

1929--University of Northern Iowa, B.A., Economics; 1933--University of Iowa, M.A., Political Science; 1943--University of Iowa, Ph.D., Administration.

### EXPERIENCE

**Universities**

Lecturer, University of Iowa; Visiting Professor, University of Missouri; Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, University of Minnesota; Visiting Professor, University of Texas; Vice President for Development, University of Miami; President, University of Nevada; Professor and Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Arizona State University.

**Public Schools**

High School Teacher and Principal, Monticello, Iowa; High School Principal, Fort Dodge, Iowa; High School Principal, Rochester, Minnesota.

**Experimental Secondary Schools**

Principal, University of Iowa Experimental High School; Principal, University of Minnesota Experimental High School.

**Industry and Business**

Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Vice President-Defense Planning; Vice President, Research and Development. A. T. Kearney & Company, Inc. (Management Consultants), Manager of Educational Services. Consultant to Executive Vice President, Emerson Electric Company.

**Federal Government**

Office of Education: Director of Student Financial Aid Branch; Director, College Program Support Branch; Chief, State and Regional Organization of Higher Education (Director, Survey of Higher Education in Connecticut). United States Navy: Active Duty - Executive Officer V-12 Unit, Minot, N. Dakota; Commanding Officer, SS Jeremiah Rusk (freighter); Executive Officer, SS Sea Partridge (troop ship); Commanding Officer, SS Agwiprince (troop ship). Reserve - Assistant Classification Officer, Western Sea Frontier.

### PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Commission on Research & Service of the North Central Association; Committee on Research & Service of the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools; Committee on Guidance of the North Central Association; President, State College of Iowa Alumni Association; Committee on Inservice Training of Teachers of North Central Association; Examiner for the Accreditation Committee for the Commission of Colleges and Universities, N.C.A.; Executive Secretary, Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals; Chairman, Summer Workshops of Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals; President, Laboratory School Administrators Association; Examiner of Private Secondary Schools of Minnesota for Accreditation by the University of Minnesota; Pacific Coast Committee of the American Council on Education; Committee on Veterans Affairs, Land Grant College Association; Governor's Advisory Committee for Secondary Education in Nevada; Eisenhower's Commitee on Education Beyond the High School; National Association of State University Presidents; American Education Research Association.

### SCIENTIFIC MEMBERSHIPS

Board of Distinguished Consultants, National Society of Professional Engineers; American Astronautical Society; American Nuclear Society; American Ordnance Association; Institute of Aeronautical Sciences; National Aeronautic Association; Association for Applied Solar Energy; Institute of Aerospace Science.

### CIVIC MEMBERSHIPS

Board of Directors, Chamber of Commerce, Coral Gables, Florida; Rotary Club and Chamber of Commerce, Reno, Nevada; Kiwanis Club and Chamber of Commerce, Rochester, Minnesota and Fort Dodge, Iowa.

### CLUBS

Marco Polo Club, New York, N.Y.; Bath Club, Miami Beach, Florida; Pennington Club, Passaic, New Jersey; National Aviation Club, Washington, D. C.; Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C.

### PUBLICATIONS

Contributor of articles to professional journals and magazines; Editor, "Higher Education in Connecticut."

### HONORS AND AWARDS

Honors Graduate, University of Northern Iowa; Pi Gamma Mu; Phi Delta Kappa; Shattuck Centennial Award (to 100 Americans who had made an outstanding contribution to secondary education); Alumni Achievement Award, University of Northern Iowa.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION IN:

Who's Who in American Education-1947; Who's Who in the Midwest-1951; Who's Who in America-1952; Who's Who in the West-1954; Poor's Register of Directors and Executives-1959; Who's Who in the East-1959; American Men in Science-1961; World Who's Who in Commerce and Industry-1961; Who's Who in the South and Southwest-1965.